



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/743,660	12/22/2003	James Beck	4132-031362	7585
28289	7590	09/25/2007		
THE WEBB LAW FIRM, P.C. 700 KOPPERS BUILDING 436 SEVENTH AVENUE PITTSBURGH, PA 15219			EXAMINER VO, HUYEN X	
			ART UNIT 2626	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/25/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/743,660

Applicant(s)

BECK ET AL.

Examiner

Huyen X. Vo

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 and 24-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 and 24-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's election, without traverse, of 1-20 and 25-26 in the reply filed on 7/2/2007 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, 7-20, and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuchitani et al. (US 6772109) in view of Hughes (US 6295134).
4. Regarding claims 1 and 24, Tsuchitani et al. disclose a method and computer-readable medium for displaying a plurality of electronic document types from a single display system, comprising the steps of:
 - a. linking the display system with a discrete pluggable interpreter responsive to an electronic document type (*col. 14, lines 1-52, a particular interpreter is selected responsive to an electronic document type; and figure 2, the client device or display is unpluggable from the server*);

c. processing inside the linked discrete pluggable interpreter the at least one received electronic documents (*col. 14, lines 1-52*).

Tsuchitani et al. fail to specifically disclose the steps of receiving at the display system at least one electronic document; and outputting display data that is renderable by the display device. However, Hughes teaches the steps of receiving at the display system at least one electronic document (*col. 5, line 44 to col. 6, line 24*); and outputting display data that is renderable by the display device (*col. 5, line 44 to col. 6, line 24*).

Since Tsuchitani et al. and Hughes are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Tsuchitani et al. by incorporating the teaching of Hughes in order to provide visual document to the user.

5. Regarding claim 2, TsuchiThe method as set forth in claim 1, further comprising, after step d), the steps of:

unlinking the discrete pluggable interpreter from the display system (*col. 14, lines 1-52, the act of switching from one interpreter to another would temporarily disconnect the display of client device from the interpreter of the server*);

linking a different discrete pluggable interpreter, wherein said discrete pluggable interpreter is responsive to another different electronic document type (*col. 14, lines 1-52*);

processing inside the linked discrete pluggable interpreter the at least one received electronic documents (*col. 14, lines 1-52*).

Tsuchitani et al. fail to specifically disclose the steps of receiving at the display system at least one electronic document; and outputting display data that is renderable by the display device. However, Hughes teaches the steps of receiving at the display system at least one electronic document (*col. 5, line 44 to col. 6, line 24*); and outputting display data that is renderable by the display device (*col. 5, line 44 to col. 6, line 24*).

Since Tsuchitani et al. and Hughes are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Tsuchitani et al. by incorporating the teaching of Hughes in order to provide visual document to the user.

6. Regarding claims 3-5 and 25, Tsuchitani et al. further disclose the method as set forth in claims 1 and 24, wherein the at least one electronic document is an Interactive Electronic Technical Manual (*within the scope of the reference*), wherein the discrete pluggable interpreter is responsive to at least one global navigational input data of a client user for the Interactive Electronic Technical Manual, wherein generated displayable output is produced from informational input, authored content and a contextual status (*col. 14, lines 1-52*), and wherein the discrete pluggable interpreter, comprises a base semantics module and any number of extended semantics modules, a symbol table, and an output module (*col. 14, lines 1-52*).

7. Regarding claims 7-8, Tsuchitani et al. further disclose the method as set forth in claim 5, wherein the discrete pluggable interpreter reuses the programmatic logic of the

base semantics module thereby producing programmatic logic that implements one or more structures or behaviors from the interactive manuals and said one or more structures to be implemented are one or more of a step or a task that are each associated with content in a semantics module (*col. 14, lines 1-52, ontology*), wherein the one or more behaviors to be implemented are one or more preconditions that are each operatively associated with structures in a semantics module (*col. 14, lines 1-52, different interpreters are selected according to determined ontology and/or other data*).

8. Regarding claims 9-11, Tsuchitani et al. further disclose the method as set forth in claim 1, further comprising, prior to the receiving step, the step of linking with the display system multiple discrete pluggable interpreters wherein said multiple discrete pluggable interpreters are each responsive to a unique electronic document type (*col. 14, lines 1-52, language, ontology, and/or other data*), wherein the display system is capable of displaying multiple electronic document types concurrently (*col. 14, lines 1-52*), wherein the single display system is capable of linking to a plurality of discrete display modules (*figure 2, client server system connected via a communication network. Through this communication network, a plurality of communication devices (computers, cellular phones, PDA) can be connected to the server*).

9. Regarding claim 12, Tsuchitani et al. further disclose the method as set forth in claim 11, further comprising the steps of: unlinking the discrete display module from the display system (*col. 14, lines 1-52, the act of switching from one interpreter to another*

would temporarily disconnect the display of client device from the interpreter of the server); linking a different discrete display module, wherein said discrete display module dynamically generates information for a particular display device (*col. 14, lines 1-52*).

Tsuchitani et al. fail to specifically disclose the step of outputting display data that is renderable by the display device. However, Hughes teaches outputting display data that is renderable by the display device (*col. 5, line 44 to col. 6, line 24*).

Since Tsuchitani et al. and Hughes are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Tsuchitani et al. by incorporating the teaching of Hughes in order to provide visual document to the user.

10. Regarding claims 13-17, Tsuchitani et al. further disclose the method as set forth in claim 12, wherein the particular display device is one of a computer desktop, a computer tablet, a handheld computer or a cellular telephone (*within the scope of the reference*), wherein the wherein said discrete display module is capable of providing customized application presentation (*referring to Hughes reference in col. 5, line 44 to col. 6, line 24*), wherein the stored contextual status is defined by: one or more states internal to the interpreter for programmatic purposes; and one or more states external to the interpreter (*col. 14, lines 1-52*), wherein the stored contextual status determines display data output based on a user's actions, current location and training background (*col. 14, lines 1-52*), wherein the set of external states is one of displaying the manual, displaying the table of contents, displaying the index, setting bookmarks, loading

Art Unit: 2626

bookmarks, setting sessions, loading sessions, executing a helper application, and executing a diagnostic tool (*web browser, within the scope of the reference*).

11. Regarding claims 18-21, Tsuchitani et al. further disclose the method as set forth in claim 15, wherein the set of states is captured in serializable objects, persisted to a database, and then restarted as needed to place the interpreter into the prior captured state (*col. 14, lines 1-52*), wherein the informational data includes at least one of serial number of a part and symptoms of a problem (*col. 14, lines 1-52, within the scope of the reference*), wherein manual type is one of MIL-PRF-87269, specification 1000D (S1000D), Joint Computer-Aided Acquisition and Logistic Support (JCALS) (*within the scope of the reference*).

12. Regarding claim 26, Tsuchitani et al. further disclose the computer-readable medium of claim 24, wherein the display data is generated by an interchangeable display module, whereby said display module may be exchanged so as to create display data for a plurality of display devices (*figure 2, client server system connected via a communication network. Through this communication network, a plurality of communication devices (computers, cellular phones, PDA) can be connected to the server*).

Art Unit: 2626

13. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuchitani et al. (US 6772109) in view of Hughes (US 6295134), and further in view of Okamoto et al. (US 6285924).

14. Regarding claim 6, Tsuchitani et al. further disclose the method as set forth in claim 4, further comprising, the steps of: receiving at the interpreter the at least one command (*col. 10, lines 54-67*); associating the informational data received with the contextual status, whereby the informational data includes at least one user input field (*col. 14, lines 1-52*); and processing the at least one command (*col. 14, lines 1-52*). Tsuchitani et al. fail to specifically disclose that the at least one command is global navigational data. However, Okamoto et al. teach that the at least one command is global navigational data (*col. 5, lines 21-50*).

Since Tsuchitani et al. and Okamoto et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavors, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Tsuchitani et al. by incorporating the teaching of Okamoto et al. in order guide users to the location requested.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huyen X. Vo whose telephone number is 571-272-7631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5:30.

Art Unit: 2626

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached on 571-272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HXV

10/11/2007

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Duffy", is written over the "***" text.